



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

thing which must be classified and catalogued by the erudite sojourners in this land of speculation. As chapter succeeds chapter, the sophisticated reader gains a pleasant sense of traversing familiar country with a guide who has found new by-paths and who selects a novel pausing-point from which to survey each of the well-known landscapes. And Professor Knight has the merit, common among "pure theorists," of always knowing where he is and telling where he is going next. As he says in the preface, this book "represents an attempt to state the essential principles of the conventional economic doctrines more accurately, and to show their implications more clearly, than has previously been done. That is, its object is refinement."

Whether this characterization will excite or deaden interest depends upon the make-up of the reader. But even those who prefer a very different type of economic theory should taste the book before putting it aside. For the distinction between risk and uncertainty is not less valid to the realistic economist than to the pure theorist. Moreover, Professor Knight plays the dialectical game with delightful skill. His book is thoroughly organized as a whole, well written in detail, and not over long. It is the fresh work of a young man of marked ability who has profited by the teaching of Alvin Johnson, Allyn Young, Herbert Davenport, and Maurice Clark—a young man interested in economic history and philosophy, and one who has had the self-control to rewrite his disquisition twice before going to press. Anyone who wishes to see what can still be accomplished in economics along the conventional lines of pure theory will scarcely find a better or pleasanter sample to study. And anyone who wishes himself to cultivate pure theory will find here abundant provocation of the sort he likes. With a little ingenuity he can make as many occasions for differing from Knight's "rigorous thinking" (p. vii) as Knight makes for differing from Clark and Fisher, Fetter and Davenport.

WESLEY C. MITCHELL.

*The Ricardian Rent Theory in Early American Economics.* By JOHN ROSCOE TURNER. (New York: New York University Press. 1921. Pp. xix, 201.)

Professor Turner has examined critically the economic writings of Raymond, Everett, Phillips, McVickar, Cooper, Newman, Wayland, Vethake, Cordoza, Tucker, Carey, Bowen, Bascom, Amasa Walker, Perry, and some lesser economists. He has explored a mine of interesting contributions which has been practically neglected by American economists of this generation. And this neglect of their own by the American economists has resulted in a similar neglect on the part of foreign economists. Gide and Rist, in their *History of Economic Doctrines*, mention only four of the fifteen economists whose writings

Turner discusses in detail. And even in these instances there is usually a bare reference to the name of the economist, the work of Carey alone receiving extensive consideration. For example, Dr. Neill's work on Raymond is mentioned in a footnote (p. 277). But Gide and Rist do not credit Raymond with sole responsibility for the inspiration of List's national system of political economy. Similarly, McVickar is mentioned on page 349 as quoted by Seager. A footnote on page 550 indicates a reference made to Amasa Walker by F. A. Walker. Excepting for the theories of Carey, Gide and Rist ignore the work of the early American economists.

Even Haney, in his *History of Economic Thought*, refers to only eight of the fifteen economists in question. And the majority of these are mentioned only incidentally, Carey again being the only one selected for detailed discussion. Raymond is barely mentioned (p. 239, 297); Everett's book is listed in a bibliography (p. 211); Wayland's name is given as one of the writers in a specific period (p. 514); Bowen, Amasa Walker and Perry are named as critics of the law of diminishing returns and of the Malthusian theory of population (p. 511, n). Bowen is named as one of those influenced by Carey (p. 249) and as a professor at Harvard (p. 516). Perry, along with Walker and Bascom, is called a product of the Civil War period (p. 514) and is referred to as a professor at Williams (p. 516). All in all, the early American economists have not received adequate study either by the European or by the American economists. Had Professor Turner done nothing more than focus attention on these contributions, interesting alike for their historical bearing and for the keenness of the analyses, his work would have justified itself.

In his introduction to Turner's book, Professor Fetter explains this neglect of the early economists on the ground that the learning of the economists in America suffered by contrast with that of their English contemporaries and also because of the "dominance of Ricardian economics in America" (p. viii).

Professor Turner gives an explanation for the tardy development of economics as a science in America as contrasted with its earlier scientific formulation in England. Our institutions of learning emphasized the classics in their curricula and our public men centered their attention mainly upon the tariff, currency, and political issues to the neglect of economics as a science (p. 5). Further, the severe industrial problems which gave rise to the study and development of economics as a science in England were not present in America where prosperity and an outward look featured the life of the people. The question of distribution was, therefore, not such a vital one in America as in England (p. 4.).

In his introductory chapter Turner subjects the Ricardian theory to a critical analysis. Ricardo, he holds, approached the rent problem through his theory of value, a labor-cost theory. This necessarily forced him to exclude rent from the elements constituting cost and led to the view of rent as a surplus, a theory which Turner does not accept. Turner approaches rent through the capitalization process and regards all cultivated land as valuable and thus as rent-bearing (p. 12). He classifies land as one of the forms in which capital is invested, in this respect placing himself definitely with that group of modern economists which has rejected the classical trilogy.

Ricardo's rent theory, according to Turner, is obscured by his shifting from commodity rent to money rent and by a confusion of the individual and the national points of view (p. 18). But the whole Ricardian analysis is to be explained by the industrial conditions of England at the time he wrote. Ricardo was influenced by his desire to make out a case against the landlord class. He based his analysis upon historical diminishing returns. Carey, on the other hand, held a dynamic view as opposed to the static one of Ricardo. Thus there was really no clash between the two; they merely posited different conditions, and it is not true, as commonly held, that Carey rejected the Ricardian theory. Carey's problem was simply one of proportionality (p. 140).

In like manner, Turner holds that Amasa Walker in his rejection of the Malthusian theory of population was assuming a dynamic state, whereas Malthus was reasoning from a static point of view (p. 173). Turner rejects the prevailing opinion that Walker accepted the Ricardian rent theory and shows that the former considered land as one form of capital (p. 177).

In general, Turner explains the rejection of the Malthusian and the Ricardian theories by the peculiar economic conditions in the newer country. Here population was the scarce factor and land was the one present in bountiful supply. The economic view of America was one of optimism and prosperity; that of England one of economic ills and pessimism. The outstanding conclusion which one derives from an examination of Professor Turner's book is that the economists in any country usually reflect in their theories the environment in which they live. The book might well have been called "an economic interpretation of economic theory."

To the reviewer it appears that the title of the book does not indicate clearly the scope of the work. True, it is a critical examination of the Ricardian rent theory, but it is something more than that. The emphasis is placed on rent but the author subjects to critical analysis the other economic doctrines held by the men whose works are studied.

The biographical notes given in the case of each economist furnish a background on which his theories stand out in bold relief. In so far as his own views are concerned, Professor Turner takes here the same position which he championed in his *Introduction to Economics*, a book in which he shows himself to be a representative of that American school of economists some of the outstanding members of which are Professors Irving Fisher, Fetter, and Davenport. The book is a real contribution to economic literature and, it is to be hoped, will act as a stimulus for further studies in which the other cardinal principles of the early American economists will be considered in detail.

CLYDE OLIN FISHER.

*Wesleyan University.*

#### NEW BOOKS

BIRCK, L. V. *The theory of marginal value*. Studies in economics and political science, no. 63, London School of Economics and Political Science. (London: Routledge. New York: Dutton. 1922. Pp. viii, 351. 14s.)

BOUCKE, O. F. *The development of economics 1750—1900*. (New York: Macmillan. 1921. Pp. 348.)

The value of an historical survey of the theories concerning some particular economic problem has often been demonstrated, most notably in Böhm-Bawerk's great work. As background to such special studies the student needs a general view of the development of the principal schools of economic thought and the relations between them. For this, however, principles of selection and arrangement are not easily determined, and none have been consistently followed in the general histories of economics. Indeed the standpoints and specific doctrines of every important period, in their diversity, defy classification.

Professor Boucke has achieved some unity by putting forward the philosophical and psychological preconceptions of the different systems of economic thought and his book merits attention on that account. It treats not of "individual writers or small groups of them," but of "currents of thought as a whole," the entire development from 1750 to 1900 being considered under four heads—Naturalism, Utilitarianism, Historism, and Marginism. The reduction to four groups is something of a *tour de force* and strict adherence to it could obviously not be achieved. Thus, in the chapters on Naturalism, it became necessary to treat of Adam Smith apart from the Physiocrats. His inclusion under Naturalism brings him nearer to the Physiocrats than to the classical school of English economists and there are some things to be said for this grouping. But would it not have been better to give him a chapter to himself? In the chapter on Utilitarianism there is of necessity mention of a considerable number of writers who are not utilitarians and who follow independent lines of thought. Under Historism we have a discussion of both Collectivism (in a very broad sense) and the Historical School proper. It would seem wiser to take the collectivists by themselves, to differentiate more clearly between the earlier and the later historical schools, and perhaps also to give a separate treatment of the Romantic school,